

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/764,630	01/26/2004	Julian P. Breillatt JR.	F-5421 CON B CON DIV	9126
75	90 01/05/2006		EXAMI	NER
BAXTER HEALTHCARE CORPORATION			KIM, SUN U	
Bradford R.L. Price Fenwal Division RLP-30			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Route 120 and Wilson Road			1723	
Round Lake, IL 60073			DATE MAILED: 01/05/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			15				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	.,,				
	10/764,630	BREILLATT ET A	L.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	John Kim	1723					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ac	ddress				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this c D (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 Ja	anuary 2004.						
· _	s action is non-final.						
3) Since this application is in condition for alloware closed in accordance with the practice under E	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		e merits is				
Disposition of Claims							
4) Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are pending in the applicat	ion.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1 and 2</u> is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.						
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on 26 January 2004 is/are	: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected	to by the Examin	er.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	tion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	ected to. See 37 Cl	FR 1.121(d).				
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	kaminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form P7	ГО-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).					
, ,	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
<u> </u>	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior			Stage				
application from the International Bureau	•		· ·				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	d.					
Attachment(s)	_						
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da						
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/26/04.			O-152)				

Application/Control Number: 10/764,630 Page 2

Art Unit: 1723

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: On line 6 of page 1 of the specification, application no. 10/084,605 needs to be updated to be US Patent No. 6,688,476. On line 19 of page 1 of the specification, "(Now abandoned," should be corrected to "(Now abandoned),".

Appropriate correction is required.

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Application/Control Number: 10/764,630 Page 3

Art Unit: 1723

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

- 3. Claim 1 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 3 of U.S. Patent No. 6,688,476. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 1 and 3 of U.S. Patent No. 6,688,476 fully suggests the structural elements in the method of claim 1 of the instant application and the method of claim 1 of the instant application is inherent step in making the apparatus of claims 1 and 3 of U.S. Patent No. 6,688,476.
- 4. Claim 2 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 3 of U.S. Patent No. 6,688,476 in view of US Pat. No. 5,591,337. Claim 2 essentially differs from the method of US Pat. No. 6,688,476 in reciting that flexible thermoplastic material includes polyvinyl chloride. US Pat. No. 5,591,337 teaches that filter device housing is made of flexible thermoplastic material comprising polyvinyl chloride material (see col. 8, lines 58-61). It would have been obvious to use known flexible thermoplastic material such as polyvinyl chloride in making the blood filter of US Pat. No. 6,688,476 as suggested by US Pat. No. 5,591,337.
- 5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Kim whose telephone number is (571) 272-1142. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays from 8:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M.

Art Unit: 1723

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wanda Walker, can be reached on (571) 272-1151. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

John Kim
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1723

J. Kim January 4, 2006